

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS***Status of Claims***

Claims 1-5, 7-17 are pending in this patent application.

Claim 1 has been amended.

Claims 33-36 are new.

Applicants hereby request further examination and reconsideration of the presently claimed application.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 5, 8, 9, and 15 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Hodge* (US 5,671,810). Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 16, and 17 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Parlar* (US 6,631,764). Claims 1-4, 7-9, and 12-15 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Harris* (WO 01/02698).

The Applicants respectfully submit that *Hodge*, *Parlar*, and *Harris* do not establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation as to the amended claims. According to MPEP § 2131, “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” The Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the limitation “wherinc the additive hydrolyses in situ when the additive contacts the filter cake.” Applicants respectfully submit that *Hodge*, *Parlar*, and *Harris* do not expressly teach such a limitation.

Hodge, *Parlar*, and *Harris* each fail to teach an additive that hydrolyses in situ upon contacting the filter cake. *Hodge* teaches an additive for a servicing fluid, however *Hodge* fails to teach that the additive hydrolyses, either in situ or otherwise. Similarly, *Parlar* teaches an additive for a servicing fluid, however *Parlar* also fails to teach that the additive hydrolyses, either in situ or

Atty Docket: HES 2000-IP-002053U1**Patent**

otherwise. *Harris* teaches an additive that hydrolyses, however *Harris'* additive is hydrolyzed at the surface, and then injected into the subterranean formation. Specifically, *Harris* teaches that his additive is blended with water at the surface and then injected down hole. *See Harris*, page 11, lines 25-32. Thus, *Hodge*, *Parlar*, and *Harris* each fail to teach an additive that hydrolyses in situ upon contacting the filter cake, and consequently do not anticipate the pending claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected over 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harris* in view of *Parlar*. Assuming for sake of argument that the combination of *Harris* and *Parlar* is proper (and without conceding such), the Examiner has nonetheless failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness as such a combination does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Claims 10 and 11 each depend from and incorporate the limitations of independent claim 1 as discussed previously. As noted above, *Parlar* and *Harris*, alone or in combination, do not disclose each and every element of independent claim 1. Specifically, *Parlar* and *Harris* do not teach or suggest an additive that hydrolyses in situ upon contacting the filter cake. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10 and 11 are likewise patentable over *Harris* and *Parlar*.

New Claims

New claims 33-36 have been added to recite further novel features of the invention. Specifically, the new claims recite the limitations that the hydrolysis occurs in the absence of a catalyst, that the additive is acetic anhydride, that the hydrolysis occurs in less than an hour, and that the hydrolysis is delayed until the additive contacts free water. These limitations are neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited prior art.

*Atty Docket: HES 2000-IP-002053U1**Patent***CONCLUSION**

Consideration of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the application, and withdrawal of the rejections and objections is respectfully requested by Applicants. No new matter is introduced by way of the amendment. It is believed that each ground of rejection raised in the Office Action dated March 28, 2006 has been fully addressed. If any fee is due as a result of the filing of this paper, please appropriately charge such fee to Deposit Account Number 50-1515 of Conley Rose, P.C., Texas. If a petition for extension of time is necessary in order for this paper to be deemed timely filed, please consider this a petition therefore.

If a telephone conference would facilitate the resolution of any issue or expedite the prosecution of the application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.

Date: 6/28/06

Grant Rodolph
Grant Rodolph
Reg. No. 50,487

5700 Granite Parkway, Suite 330
Plano, Texas 75024
(972) 731-2288

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS